

**REMARKS**

This is in response to the Examiner's action mailed June 10, 2005. Claims 1-27 are pending. In that action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-27.

Claims 9, 10, 20, and 23 are canceled. Claims 1-3, 7, 11, and 24 are amended.

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5). The Office Action states element 62 in Figure 4 is not mentioned in the description. The disclosure is also objected to because there is no description of element 62. Applicants respectfully disagree. Reference numeral 62 is described as back surface of base substrate 22 (page 7, lines 7-8). Therefore, the drawings are in compliance with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) and the disclosure includes no informalities. Reconsideration, withdrawal of the objection, and notice to that effect are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-2, 6-8, 11-12, 15-17, 19, 21-22, 24, and 27 are rejected under U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Moshrefzadeh (US 6,636,355). The Office Action states that Moshrefzadeh teaches all the elements of claim 1, 11, and 24.

According to MPEP § 2131, [a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Orion Oil Co. of California*, 814 F. 2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Moshrefzadeh, does not disclose flexible substrates that when combined result in a rigid film as recited in amended claims 1, 11, and 24. Furthermore, Moshrefzadeh only discloses a rigid substrate that can be *added* to the screens of Moshrefzadeh to give structural integrity to the screens (col. 2, lines 62-65). Therefore, contrary to the statements made in the Office Action, Moshrefzadeh does not suggest flexible substrates that when combined result in a rigid film.

Due to the failure of Moshrefzadeh to teach or suggest the elements set forth in amended claims 1, 11, and 18, these claims are patentable over Moshrefzadeh. Reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and notice to that effect are respectfully requested.

Regarding claims 2, 6-8, 12, 15-17, 19, 21-22, and 27, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's rejections. Since these claims depend from claims that are patentable over the cited reference for the reasons set forth herein, these claims are patentable at least for the same reasons. Reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and notice to that effect are respectfully requested.

Claims 3-5, 13-14, and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moshrefzadeh. However, since these claims depend from independent claims that are non-obvious over Moshrefzadeh for the reasons set forth herein, these claims are patentable at least for the same reasons. Reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and notice to that effect are respectfully requested.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moshrefzadeh in view of Zimmerman (US5,481,385). Claim 18, however, depends from claim 11 which is patentable over Moshrefzadeh. Therefore, claim 18 is also patentable over Moshrefzadeh. Furthermore, Zimmerman does not cure the deficiencies of Moshrefzadeh. In particular, Zimmerman does not disclose a combination of a light transmitting flexible substrate and a flexible shielding substrate that is rigid.

Therefore, claim 18 is patentable over Moshrefzadeh in view of Zimmerman, and reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and notice to that effect are respectfully requested.

In view of the above, all the claims in the present application are patentable over the cited reference and are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested and an early indication of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

9/9/05

By:

George W. Jonas Reg. No. 46,811  
Telephone No.: 651-736-6933

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel  
3M Innovative Properties Company  
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833